

THE DISPATCH PUBLISHING CO.
J. M. FULTON, President.

TERMS OF THE DAILY.
One year, postage paid, advance and
Six months, postage paid, advance and
Three months, postage paid, advance and
By the week (delivered by carrier) 25c
By the month (delivered by carrier) 85c
By the year (delivered by carrier) \$2.50
Subscribers who fail to receive their paper regularly will confer a favor upon us by reporting the same to the office by postal card.
All business orders and telegrams should be addressed to
POST-DISPATCH,
215 Olive st.

POSTAGE.
Entered at the Post-office at St. Louis, Mo., as Second-class matter.
DOMESTIC. By Post.
Eight to fifteen pages. 1 Cent
Fifteen to thirty-two pages. 2 Cents
Daily (10 pages) 1 Cent
Sunday (10 pages) 1 Cent
By Mail.
Daily (10 pages) 1 Cent
Sunday (10 pages) 1 Cent

TELEPHONE NUMBERS.
Editorial Building, 215 Olive st. 251
Business Office, 215 Olive st. 254
London Office, 20 Cockspur Street, Charing Cross, New York Bureau, Room 56, Pulitzer Building, Max H. Fisher, Manager.

THE SUNDAY POST-DISPATCH.
AVERAGE CIRCULATION.
1902 27,068
1901 29,905
1900 44,356
SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1903.

AMUSEMENTS-TONIGHT.
THEATRE CAYE. "Red Ransom."
SCHLESINGER'S Gaiety. "The Girls of the Night."

Weather forecast for twenty-four hours, beginning at 8 a. m. to-day, for Missouri: Light showers; warmer.

Weather forecast for twenty-four hours, beginning at 8 a. m. to-day, for St. Louis: Fair; slightly warmer.

AND thou, too, Indiana? Then let the Harrison boom fade away.

The least that can be said about the favoring of Government officials by the Keystone Bank is that it has a suspicious and unpleasant appearance.

The whole Wilson card party should apologize all around, swear off together and lie low for several seasons. The public may then be willing to forgive and forget their offenses.

The readers of the SUNDAY POST-DISPATCH may look for an exceptionally bright and entertaining newspaper to-morrow. The news field will be thoroughly covered, and the special features will be most attractive.

The honors of the commencement season are only preliminary to the larger honors which await the successful competitor of the SUNDAY POST-DISPATCH student author contest. The honors of the latter are larger than school honors, because the competition is greater and the fame they will bring will be widespread. They are worth trying for.

This defect in a low bid for the city printing should be an undoubtedly fatal one in order to induce the Council to award the contract to a higher bidder. If the Councilmen were attending to their own business they would be slow to accept a high bid in place of a low bid until a deficiency in the latter were proved beyond a doubt. The business of the city demands the same care on their part.

The close of the session of the Legislature was a happy event for the people of Illinois, but it was marred, as a legislative session finally usually is, by the rushing through of a mass of ill-considered legislation. A large part of the time which should have been devoted to sensible perfecting needed measures was wasted in personal and party squabbles, and hence the work remaining to be done was accomplished with unseemly haste.

The pathway of Great Britain is full of thorns at present. The Irish trouble is always with her, and in addition to her disputes with Portugal and the United States, which has just been put down, there are a few days in the year in which the British Government is not vexed by some pressing question, but this is the penalty attaching to an enormous domain.

The condemnation which gambling and connection with a gambling scandal has brought upon the Prince of Wales in Great Britain is eloquent of the change which has taken place in British public opinion with reference to royalty and especially the morals of royalty. Gambling a few generations ago would have been considered a mere peccadillo in a royal personage, and such a thing as attacking the throne on account of the immorality of the members of the royal family would have been treasonable and revolutionary. But now the Prince of Wales is judged as a man and his character is considered a potent element in strengthening or weakening monarchy.

A SOUTHERN newspaper, referring to the fact that the Jefferson Davis monument in Mississippi was erected within two years after his death, while Grant's grave in New York is still unmarked by a fitting memorial six years after his death, says: "New York is composed of rich people, many of them made rich by Gen. Grant's valor, whereas the people of Mississippi were made poor by him. The contrast does not speak well for the patriotism of

New York." A Chicago paper promptly quotes this as a just and timely criticism of the lack of patriotism in New York, and thus recalls the fact that a Missouri Governor who was a Confederate General commanded the militia at the unveiling of a Grant statue in St. Louis several years ago, before Chicago began to manifest her Grant monument enthusiasm by calling on New York to erect a Grant monument.

A TAX JOGGLER DEFEATED.
The bill authorizing Chicago to increase her rate of taxation for local purposes was a bit of cool effort on the part of that city, and the only wonder is that the adverse vote was not larger, and that the Legislature came so near passing it.

In order to reduce her assessment, escape a large part of her just share of State taxes and shift the burden thereof more upon the rural districts, Chicago has continually crowded the constitutional limit with her local tax rate. This enabled her to keep her assessment at a figure ridiculously low as compared with the assessment of any other city or county in the State or in the Union.

When the expense of cleaning up for the Fair called for a larger revenue she could easily have raised it by raising her assessment to something like one-fourth of the real value of her taxable wealth. But while asking an appropriation of \$1,000,000 of State money to the Fair she cooly asked for authority to continue raising her tax rate inordinately high that her assessment might be kept at the old fraudulent figure.

The rural representatives who rebelled against this cheating were only protecting their own constituents from an aggravation of the wrong to which they are subjected by Chicago's tax-jogging propensity. With more than twice the population and claiming more than twice the wealth of St. Louis, Chicago pays State taxes in Illinois on a property valuation far below that on which St. Louis pays State taxes in Missouri. The constitutional limit on the local tax rate was not imposed to prevent Chicago from taxing herself as heavily as she chooses for local purposes, and it does not prevent her now from raising all the revenue she chooses to raise. It was imposed only as a check upon her method of dodging State taxes.

By simply raising her assessment to a reasonable figure, she can greatly reduce her rate of taxation and still raise all the revenue she demands without imposing more than their just share of State taxes on her tax-payers.

CROWN WORSHIP IN ENGLAND.
It will not purify the British Army much to cashier Lieut.-Col. GORDON-CUMMING for cheating at cards and retain Gen. OWEN WILLIAMS and Field Marshal WALES, who conspired to condone and conceal the cheating. The boasted English love of fair play appears not in this discrimination, nor in the prosecution of the Lieutenant-Colonel for illegal gambling while the General and the Field-Marshal are permitted with impunity to violate the laws against gambling.

Yet even Mr. GLADSTONE deprecates the demands of the Radicals and the Dissenting Churches that all involved in the scandal shall be held amenable to the same law and the same code of morals. It is reported that he wants the Liberal party to show a decided repugnance to "any agitation tending to cast discredit on the crown."

What can be more illogical than this English crown worship? The credit of the crown, its hold on the respect of the people, must be weak indeed when it can be preserved only by the suppression of truth and the perversion of justice. When the Government can preserve this useless appendage by such condoning only, and by persuading the people that it is a point of loyalty and patriotism to shut their eyes to the crimes, vices and follies of royalty, it is plain that, instead of deriving strength and wisdom from the crown for the protection of the public welfare, the Government actually has to be the nurse and protector of the crown, and is now maintaining in it an incubus on the welfare and progress of the nation.

In this age of free press light, a personal libel in the masses blinding to the moral turpitude of a George III., or the brutality and despotism of a Henry VIII., is impossible. Mr. GLADSTONE is vainly deprecating agitation as tending to cast discredit upon the crown in the cases of such monarchs, and if the British throne can be preserved only by ignoring vice and crime in the heir-apparent and suppressing comment thereon, Mr. GLADSTONE might as well open his eyes to the fact that the aforesaid throne stands on a rotten and fast crumbling foundation.

Testimony to Their Guilt.
From the Chicago News.
The perplexing feature of this exhibition of triumphant funkiness in England is that it has not called out the police. These noble gamblers were clearly violating a common law. How a court of justice can take cognizance of this fact, decide a libel suit upon evidence which convicts all participants and yet not call out the police, is a mystery. If in the course of a larceny case it transpires that the accused also committed murder he must expect to be indicted for the murder. Every word of the evidence in the present case convicts the principals of gambling, but no one thinks of bringing them a judge and jury are required by virtue of the evidence to settle a dispute between gamblers. The English court is strutting itself by adjudicating a case wherein it must recognize and protect an open violation of its own laws.

Mr. JOHN M. WHITE is connected with the advertising department of the POST-DISPATCH and is a specialist of writing up the business interests of St. Louis and Chicago.

UNDER ADVERTISEMENT

Judge Klein to Prepare a Decision on the Forest Park Case.

ARGUMENTS HEARD ON THE APPLICATION FOR AN INJUNCTION.

City Counselor Marshall Submits a Brief in Which the Rights of the City to Grant Saloon Privileges in the Park Are Set Forth—Mr. Gibson's Pleading.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

The suit, known as the Forest Park suit, in which action is brought to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same, came up in Circuit Court No. 1 this morning before Judge Klein for hearing. Charles Schweickardt, a saloon-keeper, secured a lease from the city under an ordinance enacted for the purpose to maintain a restaurant with bar privileges in Forest Park. The matter was widely discussed at the time the lease was granted, and strong pressure brought to bear upon the city to grant the lease to the defendant. The ordinance was passed and the lease was granted. The defendant, however, refused to pay the rent and the city refused to grant the lease. The defendant then brought suit to restrain the city from granting bar privileges in Forest Park, and to restrain Charles Schweickardt from making use of the same. The city, in answer to the suit, filed a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant from making use of the same. The court, in its decision, will determine whether the city has the right to grant bar privileges in Forest Park, and whether Charles Schweickardt has the right to make use of the same.

puts forward his arguments in substance as follows:
Under this we contend as follows:
1. That under the act of 1871 the commissioners had the power to control the use of Forest Park.
2. That under sec. 1, art. 1, of the charter, the city has the power to lease any property for the benefit of the city.
3. That the Mayor and Assembly have the power, by ordinance, to regulate all parks and public grounds, and that the power to regulate, as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Gibbons vs. Ogden, means "it is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the constitution."
This doctrine was adopted and followed by the Supreme Court of Missouri.
4. That a park is "a parcel of land of local as distinguished from State concern and it is beyond legal right the property of the municipal corporation to contract a debt for local purposes without its consent."
5. That the power of the city to regulate the use of Forest Park is complete in itself, and that the city has the power to lease any property for the benefit of the city.
6. That the Mayor and Assembly have the power, by ordinance, to regulate all parks and public grounds, and that the power to regulate, as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Gibbons vs. Ogden, means "it is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the constitution."
This doctrine was adopted and followed by the Supreme Court of Missouri.
7. That a park is "a parcel of land of local as distinguished from State concern and it is beyond legal right the property of the municipal corporation to contract a debt for local purposes without its consent."
8. That the power of the city to regulate the use of Forest Park is complete in itself, and that the city has the power to lease any property for the benefit of the city.
9. That the Mayor and Assembly have the power, by ordinance, to regulate all parks and public grounds, and that the power to regulate, as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Gibbons vs. Ogden, means "it is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the constitution."
This doctrine was adopted and followed by the Supreme Court of Missouri.
10. That a park is "a parcel of land of local as distinguished from State concern and it is beyond legal right the property of the municipal corporation to contract a debt for local purposes without its consent."

Under this we contend as follows:
1. That under the act of 1871 the commissioners had the power to control the use of Forest Park.
2. That under sec. 1, art. 1, of the charter, the city has the power to lease any property for the benefit of the city.
3. That the Mayor and Assembly have the power, by ordinance, to regulate all parks and public grounds, and that the power to regulate, as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Gibbons vs. Ogden, means "it is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the constitution."
This doctrine was adopted and followed by the Supreme Court of Missouri.
4. That a park is "a parcel of land of local as distinguished from State concern and it is beyond legal right the property of the municipal corporation to contract a debt for local purposes without its consent."
5. That the power of the city to regulate the use of Forest Park is complete in itself, and that the city has the power to lease any property for the benefit of the city.
6. That the Mayor and Assembly have the power, by ordinance, to regulate all parks and public grounds, and that the power to regulate, as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Gibbons vs. Ogden, means "it is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the constitution."
This doctrine was adopted and followed by the Supreme Court of Missouri.
7. That a park is "a parcel of land of local as distinguished from State concern and it is beyond legal right the property of the municipal corporation to contract a debt for local purposes without its consent."
8. That the power of the city to regulate the use of Forest Park is complete in itself, and that the city has the power to lease any property for the benefit of the city.
9. That the Mayor and Assembly have the power, by ordinance, to regulate all parks and public grounds, and that the power to regulate, as defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Gibbons vs. Ogden, means "it is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the constitution."
This doctrine was adopted and followed by the Supreme Court of Missouri.
10. That a park is "a parcel of land of local as distinguished

